

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
09/475,391	12/30/1999	CARLOS A. SILVA JR.	06975/048001	6275
26171 759	00 10/05/2006		EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022			SHINGLES, KRISTIE D	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	
			DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/475,391	SILVA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kristie Shingles	2141				
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire  will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 J	uly 2006					
,— ,	s action is non-final.					
· ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	•					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-74 and 81-84</u> is/are pending in the	e application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-74 and 81-84</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	n)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documen						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea		· ·				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not receiv	ea.				
Attachment(c)						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/2006</u> .	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	ratent Application				

Application/Control Number: 09/475,391

Art Unit: 2141

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claims 36-74 and 81-84 are pending.

#### RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Applicant amended claims 36, 47, 68 and 81-83. Claims 1-35 and 75-80 have been cancelled.

#### RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 36, 47, 68 and 81-84 have been considered but are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. <u>Claims 36-74 and 81-84</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah (US 2001/0013050) in view of *DeWeese et al* (US 2005/0262542).
- a. Per Claims 36 and 47, Shah teach a method and a computer program disposed on a computer readable medium for providing a buddy list to a network user, the method comprising:

Application/Control Number: 09/475,391

Art Unit: 2141

- accessing two or more user-defined lists of other users for whom presence is monitored, wherein each of the user-defined list comprises one or more buddy groups defined by the network user, each of the buddy groups comprises one or more members selected by the network user, and each of the two or more user-defined lists comprising members selected by the network user, the members comprising one or more of the other users (Figures 24 and 27, page 9 paragraph 0118, page 10 paragraphs 0122-0123, page 11 paragraph 0127, accessing multiple user-defined lists of co-users whose current availability is monitored, wherein each list comprises at least one group and at least one member selected by the user);
- selecting an initial buddy list from among the two or more user-defined lists (page 10 paragraphs 0122-0124; user selects an initial buddy list by selecting a particular instant messaging service wherein each user-affiliated instant messaging service has a respective buddy list for the user); and
- displaying the selected initial buddy list to the network user on an instant messaging user interface, wherein the displayed buddy list comprises online presence information for the members of the selected initial buddy list (Figures 22-27, page 10 paragraphs 0122-0123, page 11 paragraph 0127).

Yet, *Shah* fails to explicitly teach determining television programming selected for viewing by a network user and selecting an initial buddy list from among the two or more user-defined lists based upon the determined television programming. However, *DeWeese et al* teach a television chat system allowing viewers to engage in real-time communication with other users based upon a determined television channel or program, wherein chat users may also form a buddy list or address book of other users who have the same television interests and preferences and the buddy list or address book containing groups of users interested in a particular television program, chat group, etc. (page 6 paragraphs 0075, 0076 and 0079, page 7 paragraphs 0085-0090, page 8 paragraph 0095, page 14 paragraphs 0137-0139). Furthermore, triggering of a chat session takes places by using a pop-up option to send a chat request to

Art Unit: 2141

particular program list/group, while the user is watching a television program (page 7 paragraphs 0088-0090).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of *Shah* with *DeWeese et al* in order to enable television-program based chatting wherein user's buddy lists are based on television programs; because just as a user may choose to chat in a particular chat room where those present are discussing a particular program, the user may also want to instant message a member in their pre-defined buddy list/group of users who also shares particular television programming interests as well; therefore allowing the user to communicate in real-time with selected co-users that are currently online for immediate discussion of the selected television programs.

- b. Claims 68 and 81-84 comprise limitations that are substantially equivalent to claims 36 and 47 are therefore rejected under the same basis.
- c. Per claims 37 and 48, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method and computer program of claims 36 and 47, DeWeese et al further teach wherein determining television programming comprises determining a television network (Abstract, page 1 paragraphs 0010 and 0013, page 2 paragraph 0016, page 6 paragraphs 0075-0076).
- d. Per claims 38 and 49, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method and computer program of claims 36 and 47, DeWeese et al further teach wherein determining television programming comprises determining a television show (Abstract, page 1 paragraphs 0010 and 0013, page 2 paragraph 0016, page 6 paragraphs 0075-0076).
- e. Per claims 39 and 50, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method and computer program of claims 36 and 47, DeWeese et al further teach wherein determining television

programming comprises determining a characteristic of a television show (page 6 paragraphs 0075-0076, page 7 paragraphs 0087-0088).

- f. Per claims 40 and 51, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method and computer program products of claims 39 and 50, DeWeese et al further teach wherein determining a characteristic comprises determining a type of the television show (page 6 paragraphs 0075-0076, page 7 paragraphs 0087-0088).
- g. Per claim 41, DeWeese et al further teaches the method of claim 40 wherein the type comprises sports (page 6 paragraphs 0075-0076).
- h. Per claim 42, DeWeese et al further teach the method of claim 41 wherein determining television programming comprises determining a sports team (page 7 paragraph 0088).
- i. Per claims 43 and 52, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method of claim 36 and 47, DeWeese et al further teach the method and computer program further comprising receiving information indicating a change in the television programming viewed by the network user; selecting a different chat room based upon the changed television programming (page 11 paragraphs 0116-0121, page 12 paragraphs 0123 and 0129).
- j. **Per claims 44 and 53,** *Shah* with *DeWeese et al* teach the method of claim 36 and 47, *Shah* further teaches wherein the different buddy list differs from the initial buddy list (page 10 paragraphs 0122-0124; *DeWeese et al*: page 7 paragraphs 0085-0090, page 8 paragraph 0095, page 11 paragraphs 0116-0118, page 14 paragraphs 0137-0139).
- k. Per claims 45 and 54, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method of claim 36 and 47, DeWeese et al further teach wherein at least one member of the different buddy list differs

Art Unit: 2141

from the members of the initial buddy list (page 7 paragraphs 0085-0090, page 14 paragraphs 0137-0139; *Shah*: page 10 paragraphs 0122-0124).

- 1. **Per claims 46 and 55,** Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method of claim 36 and 47, DeWeese et al further teach wherein the members of the different buddy list differs from the members of the initial buddy list (page 7 paragraphs 0085-0090, page 11 paragraphs 0116-0118, page 14 paragraphs 0137-0139; Shah: page 10 paragraphs 0122-0124).
- m. Per claims 56, 62 and 69, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method and computer program product of claims 36, 47 and 68, Shah further teaches receiving user definition of a first buddy list and a second buddy list (Figures 24 and 27, page 9 paragraph 0118, page 10 paragraphs 0122-0124, page 11 paragraph 0127; DeWeese et al: page 7 paragraphs 0087-0089, page 14 paragraphs 0137-0139).
- n. Per claims 57 and 63, Shah with DeWeese et al teach the method and computer program of claims 56 and 62, Shah further teaches wherein selecting an initial buddy list comprises selecting an initial buddy list from among the first buddy list and the second buddy list (page 10 paragraphs 0122-0123; DeWeese et al: page 7 paragraphs 0087-0089, page 14 paragraphs 0137-0139).
- o. Claims 58 and 64 are substantially equivalent to claims 43-46 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.
- p. Claims 59 and 65 are substantially equivalent to claim 43 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.
- q. Claims 60 and 66 are substantially equivalent to claim 43 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

Application/Control Number: 09/475,391

Art Unit: 2141

r. Claims 61 and 67 are substantially equivalent to claim 45 and are therefore

rejected under the same basis.

s. Claims 70-74 are substantially equivalent to claims 43-46 and are therefore

Page 7

rejected under the same basis.

**CONCLUSION** 

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure: Appelman (6,750,881), McKissick et al (2006/0190966), Cooper et al (6,754,904).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles Examiner

Art Unit 2141

kds

RUPAL DHARIA

RUPAL DHARIA

RUPAL DHARIA

RUPAL DHARIA